

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 10, 12 and 13 are found to contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (Davis) in view of Miyazaki et al. (Miyazaki).

It's asserted in the Office Action that Davis shows the synchronization pattern detecting unit, the first frame synchronizing unit, and the second frame synchronizing unit. Applicant believe the correlators in Davis are being equated to applicant's synchronization pattern detecting unit.

The Office Action is pointing to figure 4 to show the first and second frame synchronizing units. The Office Action admits that Davis does not show the first error detecting unit and controlling the first frame synchronizing unit to operate in accordance with the second position. Miyazaki is cited to show this feature.

Applicant respectfully submits there are significant differences between the present invention that is not switching circuits but controlling the first frame synchronizing unit to operate in accordance with the second position and the cited Davis reference, which simply switches from active circuit to a standby circuit.

Applicant's first error detecting unit detects the first position as different from the position of the predetermined synchronization pattern. The detecting unit then controls the first frame synchronizing unit to operate in accordance with the second position.

The Office action asserts this is shown by Miyazaki where the failure detecting circuit 2a switches an active circuit to a standby circuit. However, this appears to be different from

applicant's claims where the detecting unit controls the first frame unit to operate in accordance with the second position.

Miyazaki discloses a configuration which provides for coinciding the sync positions of the active circuit 2a and the standby circuit 2b. In contrast the present claimed invention, when a sync error is detected at one sync position, a plurality of frame synchronizing unit capture another sync position as one sync position.

The prior art simply switches from an active circuit to a standby circuit whereas the claimed invention is not switching circuits but controlling the first frame synchronizing unit to operate in accordance with the second position. This is more than the switching from an active circuit to a standby circuit.

In addition the configuration disclosed by Miyazaki is a configuration of the transmission side only, whereas the present invention is a technique for establishing synchronization in the receiving side of frames.

The features of the present invention are "establishing synchronization corresponds to each different sync position in a plurality of frame synchronizing unit, and when a sync error is detected at one sync position, providing a plurality of frame synchronizing unit for enabling to capture another sync position as one sync position." It is respectfully submitted that these features of the present invention could not be made or are even suggested by the combination of Davis and Miyazaki.

In view of the foregoing remarks it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn and this application placed in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition

for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8703
Docket No.: FUJG 17.924 (100794-11390)
BSM:fd